

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the current application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Drawings

The detailed review and comments regarding the drawings are greatly appreciated. The specification has been modified / corrected to relate the textual description to the figures. It is respectfully noted that item 765 is included in FIG. 7 and that item 1085 is included in FIG. 10.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

35 USC § 101

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because allegedly the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 15-20 have been amended to recite “tangible computer-readable storage medium” and to delete any references to signals.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this basis for objection be withdrawn.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-16, 19 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Donnelly et al. (U.S. Patent No 6,049,776) in view of Hartlaub (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087116 A1). Claims 7, 8, 13, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Donnelly et al. (U.S. Patent No 6,049,776) in view of Hartlaub (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087116 A1) as applied to claims 1 and 15 and in view

of ServicePower.com (www.archive.org/www.servicepower.com, published 11/11/2001). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "an engine that associates, based on user input, a selected service with a service order template, the service order template defining resource information for both a first task item to be performed at a field location and a second task item to be performed at a central workshop location that is different from the field location, the first and second task items to be completed as part of a service action, a first portion of the first task item occurring before the second task item and a second portion of the first task item occurring after the second task item (for support, see, *inter alia*, published specification par. 44).

Claim 15 has been amended to recite: "to automatically associate, based on user input selecting a service action from a list of service actions, resource information with both a first task item to be performed at a field location and a second task item to be performed at a central workshop location that is different from the field location and to automatically schedule the first task item and the second task item, the first and second task items to be completed as part of the selected service action requiring a portion of the service action to be conducted in the field location and a portion of the service action be conducted at the central workshop location, wherein the resource information associative with the first and second task items includes field human resource information includes availability information for field technicians and a specified field technician is associative with the first task item, central workshop human resource information includes availability information for central workshop technicians and a specified central workshop technician is associative with the second task item, and work area information includes availability information for central workshop locations and a specified work area in a

specified central workshop location is associateable with the second task item" (for support, see, inter alia, published specification pars. 40, 44, 52).

Claim 23 has been amended to recite: "based on user input, resource information with a first task item to be performed at a field location for a piece of equipment, a second task item to be performed on at least one part of the piece of equipment at a central workshop location that is different from the field location, and a third task item to be performed with the at least one part of the piece of equipment at the field location after completion of the second task item, the first, second, and third task items to be completed as part of a service action, wherein the resource information associateable with the task items includes field human resource information includes availability information for field technicians and a specified field technician is associateable with the first task item and the third task item, central workshop human resource information includes availability information for central workshop technicians and a specified central workshop technician is associateable with the second task item, and work area information includes availability information for central workshop locations and a specified work area in a specified central workshop location is associateable with the second task item." (for support, see, inter alia, published specification par. 44).

Donnelly describes an arrangement in which a resource management system includes a database about a plurality of employees, employee skills, employee schedules, and projects (see, inter alia, Donnelly abstract). By providing such a database, large projects requiring different skill sets from employees can be staffed (see, inter alia, Donnelly col. 3, lines 12-14). The Examiner has taken the position that because employees can work at different locations, and that they can have calendar files, that Donnelly discloses all of the elements of claim 1 with the

exception of location availability, and it was to this point, that Hartlaub was cited. In particular, par. 57 of Hartlaub was cited which relates to room availability in connection with the delivery of a pharmaceutical agent.

Neither of Donnelly or Hartlaub suggest an arrangement, as recited in the claims, in which field human resources can be monitored and scheduled as well as central workshop human resources in order to facilitate the completion of a service action. With Donnelly, projects can include employees in different locations and these different locations can be identified (see, *inter alia*, Donnelly par. 53). However, there is no suggestion in the cited references that a service action will require field resources as well as central workshop resources.

In addition, in order to expedite allowance of the current application, claim 1 was also amended to recite that a service order template, which is selected via human input, that is used to identify the first task item as well as the second task item. Furthermore, with claim 1, it was further clarified that the first task item takes place both before and after the second task item (such as in situations in which a part must be removed from a piece of construction equipment by a field technician, delivered to and serviced in the central workshop by a separate person. None of the cited references disclose or suggest such an arrangement.

With regard to claim 15, none of the cited references suggest that a user can be presented with a list of service actions and that such a selection results in the automatic association of the service action with resource information and that task items forming part of such a service action are automatically scheduled. In addition, as stated above, none of the cited references describe the scheduling of resources which necessarily require tasks to be conducted at a field location as well as tasks to be conducted at a central workshop location as recited in the claim.

With regard to claim 23, none of the cited references suggest a service action (as well as the scheduling of such a service action) in which a piece of equipment is serviced at a field location as part of a first task item, a part from the piece of equipment is serviced at a central workshop as part of a second task item, and the part for the piece of equipment is serviced at the field location as part of a third task item which occurs subsequent to the second task item at the field location.

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, 23, and their respective dependent claims should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. No additional fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-350.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 10, 2008

/ck3/

Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.314.1500
Fax: 858.314.1501